

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chang (US 7,130,285). Applicants respectfully disagree. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. See MPEP § 2131.

Claim 1 recites a method of improving hard handoff comprising “. . . sending a request for handoff . . . wherein the request comprises a *requested service option and a list of service options supported by the mobile station.*” Claim 4 recites a method of improving hard handoff comprising “. . .receiving a request for handoff *wherein the request comprises a requested service option and a list of service options supported by a mobile station.*” Claim 7 recites a method of improving hard handoff comprising “receiving . . . a request for handoff from the source base station, wherein the request comprises a requested service option and a list of service options supported by a mobile station.”

Chang does not teach the above-referenced limitations of claims 1, 4 and 7. Chang describes a method for providing concurrent service handoff in a mobile communication system. As stated in Chang, the conventional handoff process at the time of the Chang invention considered only the case where a mobile communication system provided a single service, voice or data. Chang contends that the conventional handoff process does not consider the case where the communication system provides both voice and packet services concurrently. See column 4, lines 55-63. A method to address the perceived problem is described. When a source base station determines that a handoff is necessary to a target base station, the source base station determines the number of currently connected services. If there is one currently connected service, voice or data, the source base station sends a handoff required message requesting the currently connected single service option (voice or data) and a SCR related to the single service option. More importantly, if there are two currently connected services (voice and data), the source base station sends a handoff required message requesting the options of the two currently connected

services and an IS-2000 SCR related to the services. See column 6, line 55 to column 7, line 18 and column 7, line 54 to column 8, line 3. If the target base station is able to accommodate the request for concurrent voice and data service, concurrent service is provided. If the target base station is unable to provide concurrent service, the connectable service (voice or data) is provided. See column 9, lines 28 - 43.

As stated above, in Chang, the handoff required message from the source base station requests the services currently provided to the mobile station – voice, data, or voice and data. Chang seeks to provide a seamless handoff from the source base station to the target base station by providing the services in use by the mobile station before the handoff to the mobile station after the handoff. Chang states “[E]ven when a mobile station concurrently provided with a first service (voice service) and a second service (packet service) through the first base station moves to the second base station adjacent to the first base station, the mobile station is seamlessly provided with the first and second services.” See column 6, lines 34-39. Thus, for the problem Chang seeks to address, there is no need to include a list of service options supported by the mobile station in the handoff request.

In contrast to Chang, the current invention of claims 1, 4 and 7 provides a method for the target base station to optimally select an alternate service option in the event that the target base station cannot accommodate the requested service option included in the handoff request. Thus, in addition to a requested service option, the handoff request includes a list of service options supported by the mobile station. Chang clearly does not address optimizing the selection of service options provided to the mobile station after a handoff, but rather focuses on seamlessly providing concurrent services to the mobile station after a handoff. Therefore, Chang does not disclose that the handoff required message comprises a requested service option and a list of service options supported by a mobile station. Chang discloses that the handoff required message includes only a requested service option (i.e., the services provided to the mobile station prior to the handoff).

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1, 4 and 7 are in condition for allowance. Applicants further submit that claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 9 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on claims 1, 4 and 7, respectively. Applicants request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,  
Scribano, Gino et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department

Customer Number: **22917**

By: /Lalita W. Pace/

---

Lalita W. Pace  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No.: 39,427  
Telephone: 847-538-5855  
Fax: 847-576-3750